

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-24 remain in the application and, as amended herein, are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for the telephone interview held on June 4, 2007 during which the relied-on references were discussed.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 12 because of an informality. Claim 12 has been amended in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

With regard to the art rejections, claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 12-14, 20, 21, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kamibayashi (U.S. Patent No. 7,065,648); claims 1, 8, 12, 13, 20, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ueda (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,102); claims 3, 5-7, 10, 15, 17-19, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamibayashi in view of Dondeti (U.S. Patent No. 6,240,188); claims 4, 11, 16 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamibayashi in view of Dondeti and further in view of Harada (U.S. Patent No. 6,850,914); claims 2, 9, 14, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda in view of Ansell (U.S. Patent No. 6,367,019); claims 3, 5-7, 10, 15, 17-19, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda in view of Dondeti; and claims 4, 11, 16, and 23 as being unpatentable over Ueda in view of Dondeti and further in view of Harada. Applicant submits that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Based on the telephone interview with the Examiner, independent claims 1, 8, 11, 12, 13, 20, 23, and 24 have each

been amended to more clearly show the differences between the claimed subject matter and the relied-on sections of Kamibayashi and between the claimed subject matter and the relied-on sections of Ueda. The relied-on sections of Ansell, Dondeti and Harada do not remedy the deficiencies of these references.

Hence, claims 1, 8, 11, 12, 13, 20, 23, and 24 are each patentably distinguishable over the relied-on art. Further, claims 2-7, 9, 10, 14-19, and 21-22 are each patentably distinguishable over the relied-on art for at least the same reasons based on their dependencies.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

Application No.: 09/911,042

Docket No.: SONYJP 3.0-190

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: June 28, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Lawrence E. Russ

Registration No.: 35,342
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant

761792_1.DOC